March 7-8, 2012 Meeting Summary
8 Groups

Note: () Indicates number of groups

Session 1: Supervision/Monitoring

Summary: Keep monitoring sublots and single lots, target monitoring based on statistical measurement and/or factor levels, continue to look at file samples versus separations, increase supervision at the local level due to timeliness of information, use local monitoring on OCIS, and mixed responses on individual rail/container monitoring. There was limited discussion of roundlots, but two small groups indicated that it should be monitored as is practical or 5%.

- **What should be covered and the appropriate level?**
    - **Official Samples**
        - Monitor by Sublot (8)
            - 2-5% (1)
        - Monitor by Single lot (8)
            - Target based on factor results (e.g., DKT >3%) (1)
        - Round lot (2)
            - As much as practical (1)
            - 5% (1)
        - Support for SIMS/STEPS/Referees, current tools
    - **Monitor OCIS**
        - No (3)
        - Local with framework (2)
        - Yes, at 1% (1)
    - **Monitor individual rail cars from unit trains loaded under Cu-Sum**
        - No (4)
        - Yes, at 1% (1)
        - Local with framework (1)
    - **Monitor individual containers from an average grade booking**
        - No (4)
        - Local with framework (1)

- **How should samples be monitored?**
    - **Statistical Measurement?**
        - Use statistics to vary monitoring percentage (2)
        - Keep existing (1)
        - No Stratification (1)
            - More U.S. #1/#2
        - Segmented (1)
            - U.S. #1/#2-Learning about equipment
            - U.S. #3/#4-Individual inspector issues
    - **Based on unworked file samples or separations?**
        - Unworked (4)

        - Separations (0)
            - Separations useful (3)
        - Both (SIMS/STEPS) (2)

- **<u>Who should do the monitoring and what is the appropriate role of the OSP and 2nd level of supervision?</u>**

    - **Role of OSP for monitoring?**
        - Official Service Provider conducts monitoring (6)
            - More timely (2)
            - Based on sliding scale (1)
            - FGIS involvement is still needed (1)
            - Standards are minimum-objective is to exceed (1)
    - **Role of 2nd level of monitoring?**
        - Anchor Agreements (1)
        - GSL (1)

Session 2: Performance Criteria, Measurement, and Incentives

Summary: Performance criteria ideas ranged from using current to increased percentages; evaluation ideas varied from evaluating all levels (agency, SSP, inspector, and grain) to only agencies and focusing on low performers. There was a general concurrence that high performance should be rewarded with incentives such as reduced monitoring, self-licensing, reduced fees, awards, etc.

- **What are the key organizational performance measures/criteria that we need to use systematically to evaluate and improve performance?**

    - **What do you want on your dashboard?**
        - Reports (2)
        - Status of draws (1)
        - Internal only (1)

    - **What metrics could be used for individual performance?**
        - Interpretative Factors, (2)
            - 90% (1)
            - +5/-5 (1)
        - Inspector accuracy for all individual factors, STEPS, Opinions, and SIMS in tolerance (2)
        - Too subject to interpretation (1)
        - 80% + (1)
        - Current percentages (1)
        - Base on select factor levels (e.g., > 2% DKT) (1)
        - Something other than pass/fail (1)
        - Evaluate over the course of a year (1)

    - **What metrics could be used for organizational performance?**
        - Checklist including SIMS, STEPS, and PAS (3)
        - Base on select factor levels (e.g., >2% DKT, Mary Vick's program) (2)
        - Variance from trend (1)
        - 80% + (1)
        - Something other than pass/fail (1)
        - Current percentages (1)
        - Combined individual and service point accuracy (1)
        - Random STEPS on export samples (1)
        - Evaluate over the course of a year (1)

    - **How should OSP performance be evaluated?**
        - Focus on low performers-best use of resources (2)
        - Overall agency, then service point, inspector, and grain (2)
        - Variance from trend (1)
        - Grading accuracy (1)
        - Certificate accuracy (# of errors)(1)
        - Customer service/feedback (1)
        - Overall agency (1)
        - Service point and then overall agency (1)
        - Must consider volume (1)
        - QMP (1)

- SIMS (1)
- Compliance (1)
- No ranking vs. other OSPS's (1)
- No performance appraisal samples (1)
- Weighted samples to look at more interesting samples (1)

- **What performance incentives would reward high performance?**
  - No incentives (1)
  - Incentives for high performance (6)
    - Reduce monitoring (5)
    - Self-licensing (2)
    - Reduce user fees (2)
    - Additional BAR/GSL visits (1)
    - Cost incentive for testing in-house (1)
    - Recognition of excellent work (1)

Quality Program Tools

Summary: Most of the quality tools such as SIMS, STEPS, Referees, Opinions, and OTS are working and should remain intact with supplemental training.

- **What are the most valuable and least valuable supervision tools?**
    - **Most Valuable**
        - STEPS (8)
        - SIMS (7)
        - Over the Shoulder (7)
        - Opinions (6)
        - Referees (6)
        - Training (3)
        - Anchor Agreements (2)
        - Site Visits (2)
        - Reinspection (1)
        - QA/QC (1)
        - Early Alerts (1)
    - **Least Valuable**
        - Anchor Agreement (3)
        - Quality Management Program (1)
        - Blind sample (1)
        - Referee (1)
        - Agency Over the Shoulder (1)
        - Crop Quality Surveys (1)
        - FOM Selects (1)
        - Performance Appraisal Samples (1)
        - SIMS (1)
        - Quality Assurance Reports/Corrective Actions (1)
        - Equipment (1)
- **Are there ways that we can efficiently enhance the tool(s) to assist OSP's in their quality program?**
    - Training/Webinars (4)
    - Online Reports (3)
    - On-site visits (QAS, FO, and/or BAR) (3)
    - Anchor agreements (2)
        - More clearly defined scope, definition, and integration with QMP
    - SIMS (2)
        - Stratify by subjective factors (1)
        - Submits selected in accordance with retention time (1)
    - Communication between FGIS*online* programs (1)
    - Work with BAR (1)
    - Roundlot (1)
        - Select sublots daily

FGIS*online*

Summary: The official system needs increased training, webinars, tutorials, practice modules, and user-friendly handbooks to navigate FGIS*online* applications. In addition, participants cited the need for increased speed, easy navigation, and a reduction in errors.

- **What information do you need from QAC?**
  - Training (Classes/Seminars/Webinars /Practice Modules/Handbooks) (6)
    - How to use FGIS*online* applications
  - Reports (7)
    - SIMS Report, STEPS Report, Factors, PAS Report
    - Filters
    - Navigation (landing page)
    - Easy access
    - User friendly
    - Customizable
    - Email
    - Add technician name(s) to originals
    - Pull QAC from ITW on sublots
    - Drop down boxes
    - Quick stats page
  - Graphs/Charts (4)
    - User friendly
    - Individual elevator/SSP data
- **What other program changes in any application would facilitate your QA program?**
  - 3rd party interface (1)
    - Less errors between 3rd party and FGIS*online*
  - FGIS*online (5)*
    - Increase compatibility with Firefox/Chrome internet browsers
    - Shortcuts
      - Grain grading information
    - Protein information
    - Customizable queries
    - Easier way to correct rejected certificate from IDW
  - FOL (Licensing) (5)
    - Reduce timeouts
    - Tab button
    - Questions & Answers
    - Allow agencies to select questions applicable to job function
    - One report to show every employee who is licensed for which grains
  - ECT (Equipment) (4)
    - Easier access
    - User friendly
    - Individual service point equipment
    - Take out email address for every DT
  - Select samples with more value (1)
  - Live feed to Cusum logs remotely (1)
  - CRT (Certificate program) (1)
    - Error check

- **What information do you need from other FGIS*online* applications to manage quality?**
    - Reports
        - QAC
        - ECT
        - FOL
        - User friendly
        - Snapshot of data
    - Agency proctored tests
    - Training